



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

adverted) as affording proof of the Divine origin of Scripture. It is a question too long for discussion here; and we must pass it by with the remark that Dr. Wiseman himself, if he has read, as no doubt he has, the works of Paley,* cannot but admire the lucid and satisfactory manner in which the truth of the historical parts of the New Testament is proved by the mere collation and comparison of different passages, independent of external evidence. Such proof of the historical parts opens the door at once to all that noble train of reasoning founded upon them, written by the same author, in his work on the Evidences of Christianity. The truth of the Gospels follows, of course; and, in short, when once we can find a spot of Divine revelation large enough for the foot to rest upon, proved satisfactorily, without external aid, the proof of the whole must be easily established. But the next thing that strikes us is the total rejection of Divine aid in the understanding and interpretation of Scripture. Cardinal Wiseman may be himself a great Biblical scholar, as, no doubt, he is; but if his pamphlet were written by an Infidel, it could not more completely set at naught the teaching and guidance of the Holy Spirit, which is *promised* to all that ask it in sincerity. It is not to prelates or priests, but to *every one* that asketh, it shall be given; *every one* that seeketh findeth, and to *every one* that knocketh it shall be opened.

This belief, professed by Protestants, founded on the express promises of God, that all who ask it shall receive the Spirit to guide them to all truth, by which they, of course, understand all vital and essential truth—all truth necessary to salvation—is not even honoured with a sneer. And yet upon this promise of the teaching of the spirit rests the true answer to that part of Cardinal Wiseman's argument, which is founded upon the variety of opinion to which the free use of Scripture leads. He argues from the abuse against the use; we say, that the humble student of Scripture, who prays earnestly for Divine assistance *cannot*, if the promises of God are true, fall into error in anything essential to salvation. If a variety of opinions be formed by the Infidel, the Rationalist, those who set their own reason above, instead of using it with the aid of Heavenly revelation, the true use of the Bible is not, on this account, to be denied to the Christian. We must observe that Dr. Wiseman perverts what he calls the "Bible-alone axiom" of Protestants; and he also is guilty of gross misrepresentation when he asserts, or insinuates, that Protestants hold that every man is at liberty to interpret Scripture according to his will and fancy, without any other guidance than his own reason. The "Bible-alone" axiom is solely applied to the question of the rule of faith of Protestants; Cardinal Wiseman treats it as if the Bible alone, and not the keeping of its precepts, constituted their religion. Again, the Church of England, and almost every Protestant sect, professes to have its oral teaching by its ministers, both in and out of the pulpit. What it maintains is not the right of capricious interpretation, but the right of exercising the reason, with humility and prayer, and thus of judging whether the doctrine taught by its clergy is in accordance with the Word of God. That the Scriptures are, as it must be confessed, with regret, they are, often turned to a bad use, perhaps made the "jester's butt" or the "drunkard's pledge," is no more a just argument against the free use of them than a similar profane use, by the same class of persons, of those relics, and rosaries, and crucifixes, which the Church of Rome holds sacred, would be against delivering these venerated things to the good "Catholic;" and yet that Church never scruples, and we suppose Cardinal Wiseman himself would not scruple, to place them in the hands of every one that professes a willingness to receive them, even the untutored African or American savage. The difficulties of some parts of Scripture present an argument equally devoid of force against the general reading of it. Scripture, we are told, is "profitable to teach, to correct, to instruct in justice"—2 Timothy iii. 16—notwithstanding the abstruseness of parts of it which do not relate to matters essential to Christian doctrine. St. Peter, when he speaks of the "things hard to be understood"—2 Peter iii. 16, 17—cautions the brethren, not to abstain from the reading of the Scriptures, but to "take heed lest, being led aside by the error of the unwise, they should fall from their own steadfastness." We cannot but regret the eagerness which is apparent in that part of Cardinal Wiseman's argument—where he brings forward every piece of hypocrisy, immorality, infidelity, and vice he can find, as if he gloated over it with triumph, and lays it all at the door of the sacred Word of God. Now we deny *in toto* that these things are attributable to any such cause. The infidelity on the continent, by no means confined to Protestants, we could easily trace to far different sources. If vice in some parts of England be on the increase, it will be found owing more to the neglect than the use of Scripture and of religious teaching; owing also to other causes in conjunction with that neglect, yet totally unconnected with religion. While we refuse to admit the unproved assertions of Cardinal Wiseman respecting the subjects of Queen Pomare to be true, we reply to them on the one hand by saying, that we are not without materials, if we had but space, to show the blessed effects of the preaching of the Gospel upon many individuals in the island of Tahiti; effects most satisfactory to those who know both by experience and from the express words of our Lord, how small a proportion the "chosen" must bear to the "called,"

wherever the Gospel is preached; and, on the other hand, by pointing, by way of set off, to those other parts of the world to which the cardinal would have referred if he found anything there to aid his argument. The wonderful changes wrought by missionary labour and Gospel teaching amongst the red men of America, the sons of Ham in Africa, and the cannibals of New Zealand, may be adduced as examples on the other side. We may also refer to the United States, where there is but little of that "underground of old tradition," where the civilization is not much "interwoven with old truths," where there is not to be found that "deference to rank and wealth, their opinions and doctrines," which Cardinal Wiseman would represent as checking the evil effects of God's word at home. There, at least, all religious creeds meet on equal terms. There the word can "run" and "have free course," and yet we do not find that immorality and infidelity prevail, though doubtless that free soil is unfavourable to the Church of Rome, as has been abundantly proved by Roman Catholic authorities within the last few years.* But if we descend to lower ground, and point to the temporal fruits of the spread of Christian truth; if, without excluding other causes of social progress, we give, as truth obliges us to do, to the influence of the Gospel by far the foremost place amongst the causes of the advancement of civilization in the greater part of the world—an influence pervading the whole of society, and operating indirectly upon those supposed to be furthest removed from its direct control; if we point to the almost unlimited freedom tempered with order, the willing obedience to law, respect for Sabbaths, regard for religious observances, universal toleration, humane laws, munificent contributions, splendid charities, and the general energy and spirit, all combining to place the English nation in a position unparalleled by anything to be seen on the face of the earth, or to be read of in the page of history; if we pursue this investigation and see the extension of all or most of these blessings from England their parent over all her scattered dependencies, as well as throughout the American Continent; we may well smile at the beggarly regiment of infidels, scoffers, and profligates, which Cardinal Wiseman is able to muster from the "slums of Westminster," and with which he vainly expects to exclude the Bible and, with the Bible, we contend, the progress of eternal truth from the people.

When we come, however, to the conclusion of all this argument—"No infallible Church, no Bible," we cannot but feel amazed at the coolness with which a Roman Catholic divine calculates the exact length to which he will permit his flock to use their reason and intellect. His whole train of argument, including that upon the Bishop of London's charge (which we pass by for the present, as founded on the exclusion of internal evidence of the inspiration of Scripture) is addressed, to the credulity of his readers, indeed, as to facts, but to their reasoning faculties as to argument. Does he flatter himself that any rational person can bring his mind to a stand still, at "no infallible Church, no Bible," and not ask the next question that forces itself upon his reason, and say—"If the Bible rests upon the infallible Church, what does the infallible Church rest upon? How do you prove your infallibility? If you say, I rest it upon the Divine commission given to Saint Peter and his successors, when our Lord said—'Upon this rock will I build my Church,' or upon the promise of our Lord to be with his Church 'all days, unto the end of the world,' I answer, are not these sayings and promises to be found only in the Bible? If you attempt to prove your authority from Scripture, I immediately retort upon you your own argument against the Bishop of London; you argue in a circle; you are 'thrown back and forward from one horn to the other;' you believe the Bible to be inspired because the Church has authority to declare it to be so; you believe the Church has that authority because you find it (or what you represent as it) in the Bible. But if, on the other hand, you declare that the Church has, independent of Scripture, an inherent authority, founded on tradition, or on something, by which it first declares itself infallible, and then declares the Bible inspired, I again retort upon you, and say, that if driven to an assertion, a mere *'ipse dixit'*, instead of proof, I shall prefer the authority of the Word of God for its own inspiration to that of the Church of Rome for its own infallibility. If the Church claims at all to be infallible, I should be more ready to give credence to that claim, if provable by Scripture, than to believe the inspiration of the latter on the bare authority of the former, that authority resting on its *own assertion*." The Cardinal must either stop the play of his readers' intellect at the particular point, and say—"Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further," or, having led the mind by a train of reasoning, such as it is, to that point, he must go a step further, and remove, from before his Church's claim, the very difficulty he has himself thrown as a stumbling-block before that of the Bible.

(To be continued).

FESTIVAL OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE RELICS OF SS. PATRICK, BRIGID, AND COLUMKILLE—JUNE 9.

In days of old, when Translations of the Bible were much less common, and less thought of, than they are now, the minds of religious people were often very much occupied

with Translations of bones and relics of the Saints, connected with which, from time to time, very wonderful circumstances were not unfrequently narrated. What is implied by a *Translation*, used in this latter sense, a good many of our readers are probably more or less aware. Those who are wholly unacquainted with the nature of the ceremony may now have an opportunity of learning somewhat of its character, from the account which is to follow; while all, we doubt not, who give this paper an attentive perusal, will feel not a little interested at the sufficiently curious particulars which we propose here to submit to their consideration.

There is published by Messrs. Richardson and Son, of Capel-street, in Dublin, for the edification of Roman Catholics in these countries, a very neat little book of the lives of SS. Patrick, Brigid, and Columkille: it is bound in green cloth, with gilt edges, has for frontispiece a handsome copperplate of St. Patrick *spificating** the serpents, and an ornamental title-page with rubricated letters, wherein the book is called "*a Triple Leaf, just collected from the purest sources*;" which prepares one for finding some rather poetical matter in the narratives to follow, and may suggest also, to a cautious reader, the propriety of examining the purity of the sources concerned; though the black letter inscription at the commencement "*For God, Our Lady, and St. Patrick*," might, perhaps, appear to some a sufficient guarantee, that, under such auspices, nothing but what was very carefully ascertained to be truthful and orthodox would be presented for perusal in the volume.

From this little book, as appearing to be the latest and most respectable thing of the kind provided for popular use, we take the following account of the Translation of the relics of the patron Saints of Ireland, occupying the last three pages of the work—(pp. 146-148):—

"During the incursion of the pirate Danes in the ninth century, the holy remains of St. Bridget were, for security, transferred from Kildare to Down, and deposited with those of St. Patrick; and soon after St. Columba's sacred relics were removed from Hy, and laid in the same resting-place. The memory of this event was indeed long and faithfully preserved, but gradually the remembrance of the precise spot in which the holy remains lay became obliterated both from the minds of clergy and people, perhaps because that, originally, the knowledge of the circumstance was, for greater security, confined to a few. The extraordinary veneration entertained for this *saintly trio* by the glorious St. Malachy, who, in the year 1136, occupied the primatial see of Armagh, made him desirous to discover their hallowed tomb; and as every means devised by his ingenuity for procuring such information had proved unavailing, and that human exertion had failed, he had recourse to *omnipotent* prayer, and, with a holy importunity, besought our Lord to reveal to him what he was so anxious to know. He was heard: for lo! after having persevered for some time in urging this pious request, on a certain night, while still communing upon it with God in the Church, a ray of light resembling a sunbeam was seen by him to pass along the sacred edifice until it reached a particular spot, when it ceased to advance. Convinced that the Divine Majesty had appointed this means of enlightening him on what he was so much interested in, the holy-primate had the place dug up, and when the earth was removed, behold! the bodies of the three blessed saints were discovered in the same grave. When exhumed, Malachy had them deposited in new coffins, and once more enclosed in their sepulchre.

"On learning the circumstance from the holy prelate, De Courcy, Lord of Down, concurred with him in sending deputies to the holy see to solicit permission from the pope to deposit the sacred relics more honourably, and to remove them to another part of the church. Urban III. then filled St. Peter's chair, and, having personal knowledge both of St. Malachy and De Courcy, he instantly ordered Vivian, Cardinal Priest of St. Stephen, to proceed to Ireland to assist at the celebration of the intended ceremony. He did so; and, on the appointed day, the 9th of June, feast of St. Columba, the *translation*† took place with the usual solemnities: the venerable remains being interred in the place prepared, in presence of fifteen bishops, and a numerous assemblage of priests.

"To preserve the memory of this consoling event, it was immediately decreed that the anniversary of '*the translation*' should be thenceforward kept as a solemn festival throughout Ireland, which decree has long since, for just reasons we presume, ceased to be in force."

'Twere a pity, surely, that there should be any just reasons for risking the memory of so consoling an event. That there do exist sufficiently weighty considerations, which might exercise an influence in that way is, however, only too certain, as we shall easily make apparent.

It is very odd that the author of the "*Triple Leaf from the purest sources*" has not communicated to his reader the year in which the above marvellous transaction is supposed to have taken place, as he might have found it, as well as the rest of the story, in any of the authorities which contain the same recital. According to *Giraldus Cambrensis*, in his *Topographia Hibernie*, Dist. iii., c. 18, the

* We hope our English readers will not deem an expressive *Irishism* inadmissible on such an occasion—we maintain the word, if not altogether classical, ought to be made so forthwith.—Ed.

† N.B.—The few italics used in this extract are from the original.

* See the *Hornet* Panline.

* See *Catholic Layman*, vol. i., page 113.

relics were found in the year in which John Earl of Morton (afterwards King John) first visited Ireland, i. e. 1185. In the *Office for the Translation of the Relics of SS. Patrick, Columba, and Brigid*, printed at Paris, in 1620, and reprinted by Colgan, Messingham, and Ussher, a full account is given of the discovery in that year, 1185; which has been abstracted by Dr. Lanigan, in his *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, vol. iv., p. 274, &c., and the substance of which is also given to the readers of the *Triple Leaf* (as well as now to those of the *Layman*), in the passage above.

But the whole account of this marvellous transaction, patronised by the Anglo-Norman invader of Down, and by the highest authorities of the Church of Rome, was altogether ignored by the people of Ireland, who had another "Translation" of their own, and either knew nothing about the one in Down, or else gave no heed to the attempts made to elicit their veneration towards it. Of the native Irish "Translation," rather more than 100 years later than the Anglo-Roman one, the following notice (copied afterwards, almost *verbatim*, by the Four Masters into their *Annals*), occurs in the *Annals of Ulster*, at A.D. 1289. [A.D. 1293.]

"A.D., 1289.—It was revealed to Nicholas Mac Molissa, coarb of Patrick [i. e., Primate of Armagh], that the relics of Patrick, and Columkille, and Brigid, were in Saul of St. Patrick [i. e., Saul, Co. Down], and they were taken up by him, whereupon followed great wonders and miracles; and he placed them honourably in a shrine again."

In the Irish *Annals of the Four Masters*, the passage in question reads thus:—

"A.D. 1293. ΤΑΙΡ ΠΑΤΡΙΚ, Coluim cille, 7 Brigid, do foillruccad do Níocol mac Mhaoilru (comarba Patraicc) do beir 7 Saball, a tóccbaíl lair. Fearca móra aḡur mhorbaile do denam dób jaram, aḡur a ccur 7 Scerim jai na cumdaḡ zo honoriach ar a hajle."

Dr. O'Donovan's note on this passage is well worthy of our attention. It runs thus:—

"It is a very strange fact that the body of St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, was said to have been pointed out by an angel, at Glastonbury, the year before.—See Ussher's *Primordia*, p. 892. But the most extraordinary circumstances connected with the history of the relics of the Trias Thaumaturga is, that the Irish annalists—that is, such as wrote in the Irish language [such, in fact, as were of the 'mere Irish,' and not of the Anglican 'pale'], do not appear to have ever heard of the discovery of them by Malachy in 1185, and hence it is but fair to conclude that Malachy's dream at Down was got up by the English party, in order to add dignity to Down, then in the possession of Sir John de Courcy. It is quite evident that the mere Irish never heard, or, at least, never believed this story of their discovery at Down, in 1185; for, if they had been deposited in a costly shrine at Down, in 1185, as stated by Giraldus, it is hard to believe that they would have been lost in the course of the next century, so as to make another revelation necessary for their discovery in 1293, when it would appear they were under the earth at Saul, in a spot unknown to all except Nicholas Mac Maelisa, the Archbishop of Armagh, to whom it was pointed out in a vision. It seems, therefore, quite clear that the discovery of them at Down, in 1185, was, like the prophecy of Merlin, already alluded to under the year 1177, a scheme of Sir John de Courcy and his writers, and that their discovery at Saul, in 1293, was a counter-scheme of Nicholas Mac Maelisa, who was one of the greatest opposers of the English that ever governed the See of Armagh. It may, however, have happened that both bishops had dreamed of bones, and that bones were found in both places."—(*Annals of the Four Masters*. Note at A.D. 1293, pp. 457, 458.)

Υπερβριν, μαρεας, zo cinnce.

There is certainly a very curious discrepancy between this note of Dr. O'Donovan's and the specimen of the *Triple Leaf* above given. Both are, alike, from writers belonging to the Communion of the Church of Rome. The one, however, contains the reflections of a careful and learned inquirer into history, while the other, although professing to derive its matter "from the purest sources," exhibits such extravagant blundering in reference to plain facts of well-ascertained history, as may cause us to feel no surprise at finding him swallow for genuine, and circulate for reception among others, the fictions contrived among the Anglo-Romish Churchmen of Down, in the 12th century. For what could well be more absurd, than to bring in "the glorious St. Malachy," to have anything to say to a transaction that occurred 37 years after his death. For, anybody who has paid the least attention to the history of that period (especially one having access to the "purest sources"), should have been aware that the individual known by the name of "St. Malachy," (who had been Primate of Ireland, and afterwards Bishop of Down), died at Clairvaux, in France, on Nov. 2, 1148; and that the Malachy, Bishop of Down, and friend of John de Courcy, who assisted at the Translation celebrated on June 9, 1185, was a wholly different person.

† Saul is now a small village, about two miles east of Downpatrick. The word means a *barrow*; and, probably, it implied, originally (as Dr. Lanigan thinks), the barn of Dichu, St. Patrick's first convert, afterwards made use of as a church.

The case now presented to the reader furnishes a very instructive illustration of the purity of the sources, from which highly respectable parties in the Church of Rome are content to draw materials for feeding and cherishing the devotional feelings of members of her communion. The "consoling event" of the Triple Leaf, the wonderful miracle which furnished occasion for a special office of its own in the Ritual of that Church, turns out to be, when examined into, "a scheme of Sir John de Courcy and his writers;" a scheme which never took with the Irish people, which none of their writers ever cared to notice in the religious *Annals* of their country (well enough disposed as they certainly were, to make mention of all such marvellous occurrences generally, when not in some special way distasteful to their prejudice), and which, finally, "for just reasons," we may now safely say, the Church which fostered it at the outset has seen it more desirable to efface, if possible, from a place in her memorials, than to submit any longer to the light of public attention.

R. K.

THE TWO PICTURES—A DISPUTE.

R. Catholic.—"Where was your religion before Luther?"
Protestant.—"Where was your face before it was washed?"—
OLD SAW.

As the delays of the courts of justice have latterly become a favourite subject of discussion, we propose to give a short account of one of the most protracted suits that have ever arisen. It is now upwards of 300 years since the litigation in question commenced, and, at the present moment, it appears as far from a decision as on the day when the first proceedings were taken.

In the sixteenth century, there lived, in an ancient manor-house, two sisters, co-heiresses.

Amongst other property that had descended to them from a long line of ancestry, were two pictures. One of which had long hung up in the room appropriated specially to the use of one of the sisters, the other in the room similarly appropriated to the other. These pictures, which were duplicates, were known to be the likenesses of a distinguished ancestor who had been remarkable for his eminent virtues. Tradition had also assigned to him all the personal advantages of beauty and strength. Of these, however, the pictures gave no adequate representation; to such an extent had the dust of ages accumulated on the canvas, that it was almost impossible to discern any trace of the original features or appearance. In the same manor-house there was also a library, which contained many ancient and curious manuscripts, and the younger sister being of an inquisitive turn of mind, spent much of her time in deciphering these ancient records. In this pursuit, she at length came upon a very old manuscript, which, to her great joy, she found had been written in the age when her distinguished ancestor lived, and in it was contained a very full and particular description of his person and appearance. The writer dwelt much on his great virtues, and on how eminently their existence was indicated by his external features, and he referred to the pictures of him as most accurate delineations, describing also their original brilliancy of colouring and well defined outlines.

Greatly delighted with this discovery, the younger sister at once carried the manuscript to her sister, and proposed that steps should be immediately taken to restore these pictures to their original state by the removal of the dust, which ages of neglect had encrusted upon them. At first the elder sister seemed well pleased with the proposal, and immediately sent for the old butler to whose care these pictures had been, for a long time, entrusted.

Now this old butler was very obstinate, and having no great taste for exertion or change, immediately raised many objections to the order of his mistress. He said that, for his part, he remembered the pictures to have been exactly in their present state in the time of the father and grandfather of the present owners, and as they had been quite content with the pictures in their present condition, he did not see why the daughters should not be so also. Besides, he said, to meddle with them would be dangerous, and in the attempt the pictures themselves would probably be destroyed. These arguments of the old butler prevailed with the elder sister, and as her own disposition inclined her to agree with the old man, she declined, though often pressed, to take any step in the business. The younger sister thus disappointed, and believing it useless to reason further with her sister or the old butler, at length determined to take in hand the cleaning of that picture which, hanging in her own apartment, had been particularly appropriated to her, and proceeding cautiously to work, she tried first the effect on one corner of the picture where nothing but the drapery could be injured.

The experiment was completely successful, and, in her triumph, she called her sister and the old butler to witness her success, but instead of convincing them by the evidence of their own senses, her proceedings only roused their indignation, and, at the suggestion of the old butler, the elder sister declared that she would separate for ever from the other if she persisted in her attempt. Indeed the old butler, forgetting altogether his position, threatened to turn her out of the house. Notwithstanding these threats, the younger sister proceeded with her task, and, after much labour and anxiety, succeeded in removing almost all the dirt and dust that had hitherto obscured the picture, and great indeed was her delight when she found that the picture, as restored, corresponded accurately with the descrip-

tion contained in the old manuscript. Again were seen, in all their original brilliancy of colouring, the noble features of their great ancestor. In them now could be traced the high resolve, the devoted courage, which had won him so high a name amongst his contemporaries, and even the armour in which he was clothed was found to correspond accurately with the description in the manuscript. Now, at length, she said, my sister will be convinced of the propriety of the course I have adopted, and, surely, she will now no longer listen to the suggestions of the old man, but will restore her own picture also to the same condition that I have brought mine to. With these thoughts in her mind, she at once sent for her sister, and showed her the picture as restored. She pointed to the description in the manuscript, as proving conclusively that this was indeed the picture as it proceeded out of the artist's hands. She was however doomed to great disappointment. The elder sister had become, gradually, still more under the influence of the old butler, and was now filled with indignation that her sister should have dared to proceed without her consent, and, assisted by the old butler, went to such extremities against her, that the latter, to save her life, fled from the mansion-house, taking with her the picture she had so carefully restored, and which, of course, she hung up in the house she now occupies.

Then commenced the litigation to which we have referred. As the two sisters were co-heiresses, and, therefore, each entitled in common to the whole property of their ancestors, the elder sister instituted proceedings against the younger, to compel her to bring back the picture, in order that it may be restored to its former state of dust and obscurity, and may again be entrusted to the care of the old butler. The following are the leading arguments urged on behalf of the elder sister by her advocates:—They say, that the picture, which descended to the two sisters as co-heiresses, was the picture in its condition before the younger sister began her operations; that the interest of the younger was an interest in it such as it was at that time; that the dust which had accumulated on, and adhered to, it, had, by the lapse of time, been incorporated in, and become part of the picture. They even went still further, and insisted that the care and superintendence of the old butler had also attached to the picture when it descended to the sisters, and that his superintendence had, in fact, become a constituent part of its identity. When urged by the evidence of the manuscript (which they were obliged to admit was contemporaneous with the painting of the pictures), and by the fact that neither the will of the ancestor nor the manuscript said anything of the pictures having been entrusted specially to the care of the old butler or of his predecessors in that office, they replied that these things were *developements* arising necessarily out of its very nature as a picture, and which, therefore, when once attached to it, became inseparable from it. And they prayed that the younger sister might bring back the picture to be again entrusted to the care of the old butler, who would carefully restore all the dust which had been so improperly removed.

To these arguments the counsel for the younger sister replied, that as the sisters were co-heiresses, the younger sister had equal rights with the elder over the pictures, and as this particular picture had been allotted as her share, she had clearly a right to deal with it as she pleased—that even if the court were of opinion that she had not such an exclusive power over the picture, still, before granting any such order as was prayed, it must be determined whether the picture, in its present state of cleanliness and restoration, be the original picture or not. For as the other side had avowed their intention of restoring the dust, she, as equally interested with her sister, had clearly a right to have the identity of the picture ascertained; and, as the manuscript showed clearly, that, in its present state, it corresponded with the description of it as it was when originally painted, it would be manifestly unjust to compel a restoration of it to that state which rendered it impossible to discover its identity with the description in the manuscript. They also argued, that all the arguments urged on behalf of the elder sister were equally strong in favour of the right of the younger to demand the production of the picture, still in the possession of the elder, in order to have the same cleaning process applied to it, as had already proved so successful in the case of the other picture. And they concluded by praying that this should be done.

Such were the principal arguments urged by the opposite counsel in this protracted litigation; and as each succeeding discussion only leads to the repetition of the same arguments, it is hardly possible to expect that the court will be able to arrive at a speedy conclusion of a cause so protracted in its course. We, therefore, submit the facts and the arguments of counsel to the consideration of our readers, and as they have the power of obtaining access to the manuscript, and of comparing its description with the pictures themselves, we trust that they will be able to arrive at a decision without waiting for the adjudication of the court.

ON THE WORSHIP OF RELIQUES.

PILGRIMAGES to the shrines in which the bones and other relics of saints are said to be preserved, and processions and other ceremonies in which they are carried about for the edification of the faithful in the Church of Rome, are asserted by that Church to be of great efficacy in promoting